

# Exhibit A

## MEHTA ASSOCIATES

[ CONFIDENTIAL ]

### CONFIDENTIAL

#### MINUTES OF [ DATE ] MEETING WITH AMAT/AKTA

Meeting Place: Applied Komatsu Technology, 3101 Scott Blvd, Santa Clara (CA)

Attendees (AKTA/AMAT): William Harshbargar (Host), Terry Francis, Kam Law, Bob Macias, Quanyuan (Troy) Shang, Nancy Erickson, Susan Tadevich, Alicia Recktenwald, Tom Boagg

Ben Mehta (Mehta Associates), Robert Khalipa (OmniTech), Karl Markert (CS Clean Systems), Ramesh Nageswaran (Syngen Enterprises)

Meeting Objective: "Total Green Solution: Atomic Fluorine for PECVD Reactor Cleaning" presented by Ben Mehta, Mehta Associates

#### Minutes of Meeting:

Ben Mehta had presented the onsite Fluorine generation process to AKTA (Bill Harshbargar and Troy Shang) on [ Date ] under AKTA's nondisclosure agreement. Ben Mehta had proposed a Mutual Non-Disclosure Agreement for AKTA and AMAT execution prior to [ Date ] meeting. Bill Harshbargar suggested that the NDA be signed soon after the meeting.

After Ben Mehta's presentation, several questions were asked regarding the costs, on-site Fluorine production technology, Environmental-Health-Safety aspects, utilization efficiency, comparison of NF3 vs F2 etc. Ben Mehta provided some of the answers and suggested that details will follow.

AKTA and AMAT process requirements for use of Fluorine are different and each company will pursue the development to fulfill their application specific needs. Terry Francis summarized these requirements in a matrix (Table 1 attached).

Attorney Eyes Only

AMAT06823

02/19/02

CONFIDENTIAL

1

Action Items:

1. AKTA and AMAT sign NDA with Ben Mehta  
(Terry Francis and Bill Harshbargar)
2. Issue minutes of meeting (Ben Mehta)
3. Fluorine generator specifications (Ben Mehta)
4. Provide preliminary cost data (Ben Mehta)
5. Fluorine test data for PE etching and reactor cleaning  
(Terry Francis and Bill Harshbargar)

Completion Date

[Dates]

**Attorney Eyes Only**

**AMAT06824**

02/19/02

CONFIDENTIAL

2

## Table 1: Requirement Matrix

### 1.1 Performance Criteria:

Cost effective vs.  $\text{NF}_3$ -Clean

Safety (S2, S98, internal requirements)

Maintenance (I+W), Reliability

Efficiency of  $\text{F}_2$ -cells vs. site elevation

### 1.2 Specifications:

	AKTA	AMAT
Impurities	[Confidential]	[confidential]
Very cost-sensitive		Cost-sensitive
Gas pad acceptable		POU
Response time 100 msec		Response time 100 msec
11-15 slm $\text{F}_2$ / platform		5-7 slm $\text{F}_2$ / platform (200 mm) 12-16 slm $\text{F}_2$ / platform (300 mm)
Anode life 3 yr spec / 1-2 hrs turn-around		3 yr spec / 1-2 hrs turn-around

Attorney Eyes Only

AMAT06825

02/19/02

CONFIDENTIAL

3

### 1.3 Issues:

On-site / in-situ POU

Piping costs,  $\text{NF}_3$  vs. anhydrous HF  
(isothermal (HF), double-contained (both), life system (both), lower TLV for HF)

Heat load, power consumption  
(F<sub>2</sub>-generation is exothermic)

Continuous vs. on-demand flow

HF purity vs. facility impact

Risk assessment / HAZOP

HF treatment costs (abatement costs)

Facility safety

Installation costs / permits

### 1.4 Bias Sets:

F<sub>2</sub>-Handling

[Confidential]

No additional environmental and safety impact  
(include disposal, containment, abatement)

GWG/HAP and community compliance

Attorney Eyes Only

AMAT06826

02/19/02

CONFIDENTIAL

4